

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AMARILLO DIVISION

YOEL WEISSHAUS,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

STEVE COY TEICHELMAN, and  
100<sup>th</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-cv-00035-z

**Affidavit of Attorney Breanta Boss in Support of Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time for Filing of Plaintiff's Summary Judgment Response**

Before me on 10/27/2022, personally appeared Breanta Boss, a person known to me and who presented me with valid state issued identification. I gave her the oath and she swore:

1. My name is Breanta Boss, I am over the age of eighteen, and I am fully competent to make this affidavit. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated, and they are true and correct.

2. I am a newly licensed attorney in the State of Texas.

3. I am an Attorney of Record in the above-entitled action, and I am familiar with the file, records, and pleadings in this matter.

4. On September 7, 2022, the Court entered its First Amended Scheduling Order providing a response deadline within 14 days after a Motion for Summary Judgment Response is filed.

5. On September 28, 2022, Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. (ECF 27).

6. Counsel's paralegal made an oversight in calendaring the response deadline as twenty-one days from filing of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment as laid out in Local Rule 7.1, and not fourteen days as laid out in the Court's Scheduling Order (Doc 25); thus, Plaintiff's Counsel submitted a Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on October 19, 2022 – 7 days past the response deadline (but within the deadline Plaintiff's Counsel mistakenly believed was correct due to the oversight in calendaring the deadline).

7. I do not seek extension to file Plaintiff's Summary Judgment Response out of bad faith or for purpose of delaying this case as I have not missed any filing deadlines previously set out by the Court in this case.

8. Granting an extension should not prejudice Defendant as Defendant has provided his Reply in Support of Summary Judgment and Defense Counsel has indicated he is unopposed to filing of this Motion.

9. Granting an extension will not negatively impact judicial economy as an extension will not disrupt the remaining deadlines set out in the Court's Scheduling Order including the trial date.

10. Counsel will make sure to scrutinize the Court's orders more carefully to ensure future oversights do not occur.

This letter of presentment was signed for on 10/27/2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Breanta Boss", written over a horizontal line.

Breanta Boss

State of Texas County of Dallas SWORN to and SUBSCRIBED before me, the undersigned authority, on the 27<sup>th</sup> of 10 2022, by Breanta Boss

P. DWD Notary Public, State of Texas.

